Appl. No. 10/773,950 Amdt. dated October 19, 2004 Reply to Office Action of August 23, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 17-18 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 16 and 19 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,657,227.

Claims 16 and 19 have been amended to more clearly recite "the substrate." The Section 112 rejections are believed to be overcome.

A terminal disclaimer is submitted herewith to overcome the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

In view of the foregoing, all claims now pending in this Application are believed to be in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400, extension 5252.

Respectfully submitted,

George B. F. Yee Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor

San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 415-576-0300

GBFY:cmm 60298904 v1